



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,412	07/01/2003	John D. Coleman	066561.0103	9455

24735 7590 03/09/2004

BAKER BOTTS LLP
C/O INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
THE WARNER, SUITE 1300
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2400

EXAMINER

ESTREMSKY, GARY WAYNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3677

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/609,412</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>COLEMAN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Gary W Estremsky</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>3677</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 8-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.</p> |
|--|---|

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 46,472 to Jenks.

Jenks '472 teaches Applicant's claim limitations including : a "keeper" - indent shown in Fig 3 is disposed on a "first window", "selectively retractable element" - protruding portion of D as shown in Fig 3, a "rotatable lever" - E, "having a tab" - g, a "spring slide" - D.

As regards claim 2, Jenks '472 illustrates a "central aperture" as shown in Fig's 2,3.

3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 530,078 to Ammerman.

Ammerman '078 teaches Applicant's claim limitations including : a "keeper" - 2 is shown mounted on a frame but is inherently 'capable of being disposed' on a first window sash where it's noted that the invention does not include the first window as part of the invention whereby functional limitation is broad. See MPEP 2114. It has been

Art Unit: 3677

held that the recitation that an element is "capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138. Ammerman '078 further teaches : "selectively retractable element" - 13, a "rotatable lever" - 9, "having a tab" - 10, a "spring slide" - 12.

As regards claim 4, Ammerman '078 teaches a "shaft" - 8, "secured to said spring" - via part 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 46,472 to Jenks.

Although Jenks '472 does not explicitly disclose the "spring slide is spring steel", it would have been an obvious design choice or engineering expedient for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the spring from spring steel where the examiner takes Official Notice that use of spring steel is well known in the art, and the use of spring steel over some other spring material (generically inherent to teaching of the reference) would not otherwise affect the function of the device whereby one of ordinary skill in the art would have more than a reasonable expectation of success. It has been held to be

Art Unit: 3677

within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 530,078 to Ammerman.

Although Ammerman '078 does not explicitly disclose the "spring slide is spring steel", it would have been an obvious design choice or engineering expedient for one of ordinary skill in the art to make the spring from spring steel where the examiner takes Official Notice that use of spring steel is well known in the art, and the use of spring steel over some other spring material (generically inherent to teaching of the reference) would not otherwise affect the function of the device whereby one of ordinary skill in the art would have more than a reasonable expectation of success.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4 and 8-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 230,476 to Green.

U.S. Pat. No. 562,104 to Veer.

U.S. Pat. No. 997,343 to Troth.


U.S. Pat. No. 1,235,075 to Stamm.

U.S. Pat. No. 2,896,988 to Hitzelberger.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary W Estremsky whose telephone number is 703 308-0494. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703 306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gary W Estremsky
Examiner
Art Unit 3677